



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,274	09/30/2003	Jesse B. Griggs	PA0508DGA03	6566

25691 7590 12/06/2004

SEH AMERICA, INC.
M/S 58-1-921
4111 N.E. 112TH AVE.
VANCOUVER, WA 98682

EXAMINER

HITESHEW, FELISA CARLA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,274

Applicant(s)

GRIGGS ET AL.

Examiner

Felisa C. Hiteshew

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,8,9 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,10 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date see attached paper.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-5; 8, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korb, et al.

Korb, et al teaches an improved apparatus and method for reducing pendular motion of a pull wire of a crystal pulling apparatus for reducing eccentricity of the pull wire centerline with respect to the axis of rotation of the crystal lifting mechanism. The single crystal-pulling machine includes a growth chamber, a crucible in the growth chamber, a pulling chamber above the growth chamber, a rotatable support operatively mounted on the pulling chamber for rotation relative to the pulling chamber, and a crystal lifting mechanism for supporting a crystal. The apparatus comprises a guide

bushing and an adjustment mechanism. The apparatus is adapted for adjusting the position of a pull wire of a crystal-pulling machine to dampen pendular motion of the pull wire during production of a monocrystal. The apparatus comprises a guide, at least one sensor, an actuator mechanism and a controller. The guide has an opening there through for passage of the pull wire, The position sensor is adapted for generating a position signal, representative of the lateral position of a portion of the pull wire, a crystal lifting mechanism (which contains a "winding drum") and the actuator mechanism is adapted for adjusting the lateral position of the guide. The controller is responsive to the position signal for controlling the actuator mechanism as a function of the position of the pull wire as represented by the position sensed by the sensor to dampen pendular motion of the pull wire during production of a single crystal. (See column 1, lines 51-68 and column 2, lines 1-51, respectively.

The difference being that Korb, et al does not exactly teach an active damping module comprising an interceptor or a spring or a hydraulic control loop dampener. However, in the absence of unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize and modify the apparatus limitations, as taught by Korb, et al. The motivation being that the apparatus of Korb, et al reduces eccentricity of the pull wire centerline with respect to the axis of rotation and eliminate stresses along with other dislocations to the crystal that would otherwise reduce the quality of the produced single crystal.

The prior art reference by Mizuishi, et al is being cited because it teaches a similar single crystal pulling apparatus to help prevent wire vibrations in order to avoid

Art Unit: 1765

the formation of deformed growth of the pulled crystal and thus reduce the occurrence of dislocations in the pulled crystal.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill might reasonably infer from the teachings. In re Opprect 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (CAFC 1989); In re Bode 193 USPQ 12; In re Lamberti 192 USPQ 278; In re Bozek 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969); In re Van Mater 144 USPQ 421; In re Jacoby 135 USPQ 317; In re LeGrice 133 USPQ 365; In re Preda 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968).

Expected beneficial results are evidence of obviousness, just as unexpected beneficial results are evidence of unobviousness. In re Novak 16 USPQ 2d 2041 (Fed. Cir., BPAI 1989); In re Hoffman 194 USPQ 126 (CCPA 1977); In re Skoll 187 USPQ 481 (CCPA 1975); In re Skoner 186 USPQ 80 (CCPA 1975); In re Garshon 152 USPQ 602 (CCPA 1967).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6, 7, 10 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Felisa Hiteshew whose telephone number is (571) 272-1463. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursdays from 5:30 AM to 3:00 PM. and second Fridays from 5:30 AM to 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Art Unit: 1765

supervisor, Nadine Norton, can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-1463.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866- 217-9197 (toll-free).


FELISA HITESHEW
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art 1765